Today's Topics:

From: ncar!wam.umd.edu!infinity
Subject: (none)
Date: 27 Apr 91 02:43:16 GMT

From: David Elmore Coleman <infinity@wam.umd.edu>

Re:SERIOS BUSINESS

Pete Porro notes that '[Arthur C. Clarke] does say that there is a question
as to the viability of the events.'

Wait a minute, the guy whom you are debating, who defends Serios,
has just provided information (the second edition of the _World of
Serios_ or whatever) that debunks A.C and you are now saying that
in spite of what hard core reasoning might be in the book, A.C's
point blank mere statement overrides it. You seem to being saying,
'it's not fair that AC could be infallible and not omniscient about
the Serios case.' Have you heard of fillibusters? Skeptical thinkers
have a hard time avoiding doing it.

Further, Pete says,
+It's unreasonable to stick to something that has been proven fraud over
+ and over again, just because of defensive thoughts.

Wait again, o.k, stand in line...
Skeptics make accusations, such as that the gizmo is not a handicap,
but a miracle technodevice. Does this constitute *proving* Serios
bogus 'over and over again.'? No.
 The reason proponents stick to their defenses is because of
the one-time treatment of cases by skeptics. A skeptic looks at a
photograph of a UFO, sees a faint film incongruity running linear
through the UFO image, calls the photo 'the most obvious hoax I
have ever seen' (This is from Klass), and asserts that since the
flaw *could* be a hoax (i.e a model hanging by that linear

incongruity) it *is* a hoax, because which is more likely, a hoax or
a real UFO? This Klass believed. So, the skeptic ceases to consider
the case worthy of investigation. But, along comes Bruce Maccabee
who shows through the simplest of simple reasoning how the line on
the photo *absolutely* could not have been a string (i.e it passed
in front of the UFO and *clearly* off center). Now Klass could *never*
have found this, because he is a very shotty investigator. He considered
the case closed, no matter the other evidence in the case. Well, what if
the aliens landed at a stadium at Gulf Breeze and ABC, NBC, CBS all filmed
it land among the football players. Well, this tells you that no piece of
evidence that *could* be a hoax eliminates any other evidence or concludes
a case to *be* a hoax. Back to the subject: skeptics pull this garbage
and proponents, who have invested more time and money into the case,
and who are *very* afraid of a giant case like this going to waste on
the pile of other cases the believe skeptics have treated poorly, never
will believe a mere accusation of impropriety is itself proof of an
impropriety and thus will look at the details of the case further. As
with all non-paranormal accusations, which you find implied by people
recurrently in the real world, most accusations of incongruity turn out
to be solved in such a way that the defender of the case can absolve his
case easily. I can easily put two *carefully selected* (selected by bias)
facts together to indicate 'suspicion' or "incongruity" about you if I
had a partial knowledge of your life. I could imply you are a malicious
or underhanded person. Thus, accusation is easy. 'Suspicion' should never
be taken, even in the context of EXTRAordinary cases, to be reason to
be incomplete in treating the case. But, how much money do you want
to put down AC Clarke merely looked into Randi's or Klass's books, found
the clear indications of fraud, so deftly stated out of full context of
the cases they are taken from, and converted it into a session for his show.
Would he ever look to see if Serios & gang, the proponents, washed away
the criticisms of Serios by merely returning the coverage of the case to
the *full* context of the case, or by providing new information on Serios,
or by digging up background information originally thought not to be
important? Skeptics assume that 'demolishing criticism' demolishes a case,
when in reality most all cases (Rendelsham, Gulf Breeze, Roswell, etc)
immediately turn up evidence that refutes the skeptic.

      More galactic thoughts from:
Amicitia Subjugat Omnia   Hweohthte... (Hwe-oath-T)
   ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ----
David E. Coleman   infinity@wam.umd.edu
8125 48th Ave, Apt. 612
College Park, MD 20740   1-(301)-474-7424
   ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ----
Unknowingly, he picked up a whirly blue throwstone with strange hieroglyphics
on the opposite side he didn't see, and he tossed it into the sunlit stream;
A note said he had opened a gate to some place indescribable.
   ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ----

----

Pete Porro says, '...it is because each event is independent. I hope to
keep thinking that way also. Each case or event is judged on individual
merits.'

Oh... So, if 25 million people see UFOs, which is the case, then in effect
the strength of the argument that UFOs exist is no greater than the
strength of the strongest of the 25 million cases? Hmmm... I think...
......NOTTTT!!! Try applying your thinking to something like a
nonparanormal issue, and you will look ridiculous. And, the scientific
method does NOT change once you move to the paranormal, although some
of the idiotic assumptions in the 17th century wording of the method,
which is the same as it is today, were based ONLY on the assumption that
nondeterministic/noncausal things do not exist.
 (Spinning off) When the *rest* of the scientific method, the part,
i.e hypothesis is part of the rest, the part that does not depend on such
bad assumptions, has disproven the part that does depend on
assumptions, since it has disproven the assumptions, irregardless
of whether or not you consider the part that depends on the assumptions.
The part that depends on assumptions cannot prove itself, by using its
arbitrary placement in the scientific method to steer the scientific
method away from disproving the part that depends on assumptions.
Chaos, paranormal experimentation (now to rhetoric me on that one, it
is not the point), a new calculation that allows Maxwell's demon,
and the anomaly of awareness covering biological machines that are
made up of nonawarenesses. This list, although perhaps none of the
above are 100 percent proven, is enough that you cannot simply
include arbitrary assumptions in your scientific method until you
conclusively prove that the assumptions are not violated by the list
I just gave.

        More galactic thoughts from:
Amicitia Subjugat Omnia   Hweohthte... (Hwe-oath-T)
  ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ----
David E. Coleman   infinity@wam.umd.edu
8125 48th Ave, Apt. 612
College Park, MD 20740   1-(301)-474-7424
  ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ----
Unknowingly, he picked up a whirly blue throwstone with strange hieroglyphics
on the opposite side he didn't see, and he tossed it into the sunlit stream;
A note said he had opened a gate to some place indescribable.
  ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ----

----

From: ncar!cwns2.INS.CWRU.Edu!ak842
Subject: The Universe
Date: 27 Apr 91 17:22:16 GMT

From: ak842@cleveland.Freenet.Edu (Douglas Dever)

The theory I based my comments about the universe on were from the 'Big Bang
Theory.' That's where a single atom explodes and everything rushes away
from everything else at the speed of light. According to many scientists...
everything is still moving farther and farther apart from everything else
so this is the theory that they've been going on. (Some scientists at least)
So I basically got my informmation from the books I've been reading....

*** Proud Member of The Cleveland Free-Net UFOlogy SIG ***

--
__ Douglas A. Dever __   ! INTERNET: ak842@cleveland.freenet.edu
****** IRC CHAT ******   !   ac502@medina.freenet.edu (soon I-net)
****** Niltsiar ******   ! BITNET: ak842%cleveland.freenet.edu@cunyvm
I cannot be held responsible for this message since my foot is in my mouth.

From: ncar!cwns1.INS.CWRU.Edu!ak842
Subject: Bill Cooper
Date: 27 Apr 91 18:56:54 GMT

From: ak842@cleveland.Freenet.Edu (Douglas Dever)

'Flashing red lights don't make an alian spacecraft :-) '
(Or something to that effect)
I never said that they did... I just thought that I've seen enough prove
to believe that the crafts to exsist and are visiting this planed. My
earlier message made a bad assuption about Skeptics. Sorry...
As for the flashing red lights... imagine someone like that living near
an airport... 'Hello... yea... there's a UFO going over my house ever 5
or so minutes.... ' :-)

*** Proud Member of The Cleveland Free-Net UFOlogy SIG ***

--
__ Douglas A. Dever __   ! INTERNET: ak842@cleveland.freenet.edu
****** IRC CHAT ******   !   ac502@medina.freenet.edu (soon I-net)
****** Niltsiar ******   ! BITNET: ak842%cleveland.freenet.edu@cunyvm

I cannot be held responsible for this message since my foot is in my mouth.

From: Linda.Bird@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Linda Bird)
Subject: YES
Date: 24 Apr 91 03:21:00 GMT

Robert,
    I have your address, and it will be in the mail in a few days. The
title is NASA RECONSIDERS FINDINGS: Martian Pyramids and Humanoid Face
May Hold Clues to Our Earthbound Origins.
    I'll also include a couple of xerox copies of the Face & pyramids.
    Thanks for your interest!
                                Linda
--
Linda Bird - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Linda.Bird@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

From: Linda.Bird@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Linda Bird)
Subject: Re: Question from a UFOlogy Sig User - Help
Date: 24 Apr 91 03:28:00 GMT

Clark!
     Speak of the Devil (W. Cooper)! He's going to be on our local
KFYI Radio this Saturday night on "The Middle of the Damn Night Show",
starting at 11:00 p.m.   I'll post something about it (if I'm able to
stay up that late) and if I'm able to beat Jim Speiser to it! Hehehe!
(Just kidding, Jim...)
               Stay tuned,
                      Linda
--
Linda Bird - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Linda.Bird@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

From: ncar!anubis.network.com!logajan
Subject: Pleidians need better calculators!
Date: 28 Apr 91 07:28:27 GMT

From: logajan@anubis.network.com (John Logajan)

RE: The Grey Men Tape
          or
Our space brothers, the Pleidians, need better calculators.

In the excerpt of the Grey Men Tape, uploaded on Paranet by
Gregory B. Lush, either the Pleidian or his spokesman (I'm not
clear on this point) makes an error in a simple calculation.

He was discussing the Federal Reserve's fractional reserve system
in which a bank can loan out 95% of its deposits holding only 5%
in reserve. The Pleidian correctly points out that some or all of
those loaned out funds can come back into the banking system as
deposits -- but the Pleidian, in taking a $1000 original deposit
example, concludes that the end result would be a total of
$20,229.60 increase in the money supply. This is wrong, for at a
5% reserve and a $1000 original deposit, the increase in the money
supply would be $20000.00. Or, 1/.05 * $1000, the inverse of the
reserve requirment times the original deposit.

Or you can do the iteration with a simple Basic program, below.

```
10 t=1000
20 s=1000
30 r=t*.05
40 t=t-r
50 s=s+t
60 print s
70 goto 30
```

t = the deposits, r = the reserve requirements, s = the money
supply as it increases with each subsequent deposit.

This program is simple and will run forever as the deposits become
tiny fractions of a penny. But you will see the value of 's'
converge on $20000.

Note that the original deposit is immediately added to the total
money supply, and so therefore you wouldn't want to add the
reserve again to the money supply or you'd be double counting it.
But if you insist on doing so, change line 50 to:

```
50 s=s+t+r
```

You will find now that the total money supply is no longer
$20,000, but $21,000 -- exactly $1000 more (and not the $20,229.60
figure of the Pleidian.)

Purists note: I ran a slightly more complex version of the
program that took into account that transactions are always
rounded to the nearest penny. Then the result is $19998.88. If
you always round down on reserve requirements, then the result is

$20016.63. If you always round up the reserve requirements you
get $19982.53. Again none of the results are near the Pleidian's.

A further related theoretical error of the Pleidian is to assert
that the oil money we oil consumers paid the Arabs is coming back
into the banking system and causing a 20:1 inflation (or profit to
the bankers.) This too is false. The 20:1 thing happened long ago
and has stabilized. That is to say, when we pay for gas, we only
transfer money from one bank to another, therefore one bank has
its reserves reduced in exactly the same amount another has it
increased. (Which assumes human beings keep all monies in time
deposit accounts so as to reach the maximum 20:1. This certainly
is false as a large hunk of money is in the form of currency, so
the 20:1 ratio is never actually realized. However, various
factors including consumer withdrawal from banks or consumer
deposits into banks can have a leveraged effect on the money
supply. So the money supply can vary within the 20:1.)

Ongoing inflation is a result, not of the fractional reserve
system, per se, since it was a one time impulse which converged,
as my Basic program shows, to a certain money supply, given an
initial money supply, but rather the result of government
manipulations which increase the reserves -- i.e. the so called
(and correctly called) 'printing presses.'

The primary beneficiary of inflation is the government itself,
rather than the bankers. I'm not saying that bankers don't have
favored status in the eyes of the government, but there is no way
they are making a 20:1 profit on deposits (because there is no
mechanism, as I have shown, to allow them to do so.)

The benefit the government gets from inflation is that it is
simply printing up money. The fact that it smuggles it out
through the fractional reserve banking system is almost
irrelevant.

What has this all to do with UFO's? I don't know. I'm just
setting the record straight.

- John Logajan @ Network Systems; 7600 Boone Ave; Brooklyn Park, MN 55428
- logajan@ns.network.com, 612-424-4888, Fax 612-424-2853

From: ncar!wam.umd.edu!infinity
Subject: Periodical: Kindred Spirit
Date: 29 Apr 91 09:21:04 GMT

From: David Elmore Coleman <infinity@wam.umd.edu>

Does anybody out there know where I can send to to receive a subscription
to _Kindred Spirit_?

You can reply to me at infinity@wam.umd.edu or aq017@cleveland.freenet.edu,
or you can make the address general knowledge, if you know it.
 Thankx.

From: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: Re: Csicop Members
Date: 25 Apr 91 05:07:00 GMT

->Obviously, it
->includes Paul Kurtz (chairman, humanist high-muckity-muck,
->and prof. of
->philosophy at SUNY Buffalo). I would guess the rest to be
->as follows:
->James Alcock (prof. of psychology, York U.), Kendrick
->Frazier (editor),
->Phil Klass, Randi, and Ray Hyman (prof. of psychology, U.
->of Oregon).
->Possibly CSICOP's Executive Director also serves -- the
->fourth and
->current one being Barry Karr.

I used to know the answer to this question, but now I'm just guessing. But I
think you've nailed them all. The only one I'm not real certain of is
Alcock. Oh, and I think I read somewhere that whatsisname from Cal Poly, the
guy that plays with Pterodactyls.....MacReady, I think he was named a couple
of years back, wasn't he?

Jim

--
Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

From: Robert.Mcgowan@f414.n154.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Robert Mcgowan)
Subject: Re: INCIDENT-INDIAN POINT

Date: 23 Apr 91 22:18:08 GMT

Don,

  Didn't Greenwood and Fawcett write about Indian Point in their book Clear
Intent, I read it some where was that it?
--
Robert Mcgowan - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Robert.Mcgowan@f414.n154.z1.FIDONET.ORG

Hudson Valley Geology

OK, I have looked for information on the geology/chemistry of
the Westchester/Putnam/Fairfield county region where the
numerous lakes were found where the Boomerang(s) and Triangles
flew in the Hudson Valley UFO mystery. This was all I could
come up with, without looking for geodetic surveys. This
more time-consuming move I will get around to when I have
the time, hopefully soon.

 From 'Roadside Geology of New York,' 1985 (Van Diver)
 Oops, forget to get the author's name, damn it.
     pp.83-4.
  The Hudson Highlands: mostly gneisses, some
   amphibolites. Oldest rocks in New York State,
   formed 1.1-1.3 million years ago. 'This is a
   region of knobby, small, almost conical hills
   lacking any conspicuous alignment, and lots of
   marshy, shallow valleys, small lakes, and large
   man-made reservoirs.'

Well, that's all of it for now -- not much.
     More galactic thoughts from:
Amicitia Subjugat Omnia   Hweohthte... (Hwe-oath-T)
  ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ----
David E. Coleman   infinity@wam.umd.edu
8125 48th Ave, Apt. 612
College Park, MD 20740
  ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ----
Unknowingly, he picked up a whirly blue throwstone with strange hieroglyphics
on the opposite side he didn't see, and he tossed it into the sunlit stream;
A note said he had opened a gate to some place indescribable.

```
---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ---- ----
```

********To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to********
                    'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP {ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara
DOMAIN infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com
ADMIN Address infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com
  {ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara-request

*****************The**End**of**Info-ParaNet**Newsletter**********************